DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 424 607 CS 509 938

AUTHOR Paterno, David J.
TITLE Making Sense of the American Family: Audience Constructions of Social Realities through Television and Interpersonal Relationships.
PUB DATE 1998-04-23
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Communication Association (Saratoga Springs, NY, April 23-26, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Divorce; *Family (Sociological Unit); Higher Education; Interpersonal Relationship; Questionnaires; Student Surveys; Tables (Data); Television Research; *Television Viewing; Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS *Cultivation Theory (Television); Prime Time Television; *Social Reality; Students as Subjects

ABSTRACT

A study addressed two issues: the degree to which television accurately reflects, lags behind, or exaggerates the presentation of divorce; and whether or not a cultivation effect influences estimates about divorce rates among couples. A questionnaire was designed for administration to participants, 175 undergraduate students in an introductory communication course at a Carnegie Foundation Research II University. Morgan and Shanahan (1995) have found that college-aged adults have the most robust cultivation effects across 20 years of analysis, and additionally, undergraduate students watch a great deal of television. Data supported the hypothesis that an identifiable pattern of families on television existed; moreover, the presentation of families on television overestimated rates of divorce and also of widowed parenthood. Measurable cultivation did not occur in this sample of students; programming did not seem to lead or be related to estimates of the kinds of families these students felt were found in reality. Instead of abandoning cultivation, the study of television could be broadened to include what people actually do when they sit in front of a TV screen. Studying the process of watching television may be useful in accounting for how viewers construct information environments within interpersonal relations. (Appendixes contain a sample survey, a typology of marriage and family life on prime time television, and statistical data; a 21-item reference list is also attached.) (NKA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 424 607

Making Sense of the American Family: Audience Constructions of Social Realities through Television and Interpersonal Relationships

David J. Paterno
University at Albany

Presented to: Eastern Communication Association
Saratoga Springs, New York
April 23, 1998

CS509938

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Paterno

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Communication Research and Theory: Cultivation Analysis

The advent of cultivation theory marks an important moment in the field of mass communication research. Gerbner (1976) was first among researchers to challenge the assumption that only content labeled as *news* by broadcasters was used in the *information environment* of viewers. According to the basic theoretical tenets of cultivation analysis, television is considered to be a medium which generates "messages as an environment within people's lives" which are used by viewers to "define themselves and others" (Signorielli, 1990, p. 18). Today, cultivation analysis continues to be useful for contemporary mass communication studies because this body of work promotes an understanding about the ways in which entertainment-based programming may be *used by* viewers as an *information resource* about real social issues.

But if communicators interact with society in both a realtime, face-to-face manner (speaking to one's family and friends) as well as in a tele-mediated fashion (watching television) how often do we use television to augment our ideas about what is *out there in the world?* Cultivation analysis suggests that people who view a great deal of televised content will tend to report a view of the world which appears more similar to the view as portrayed on television (Gerbner and Gross, 1976). Conversely, those who watch little television will have a less distorted view of the *real world.* It has been found, for example, that heavy television viewers (exposed to a great deal of violent programming) tend to believe that their neighborhoods are more violent than crime records suggest (Gerbner and Gross, 1976). Other studies, however, have found that the observed influence of television in cultivation disappears when demographic controls are added to collected survey data (Douglas and Olson, 1995). While the strength of the remaining effects are generally quite modest, they represent a nearly constant rate of about 10 percent across the past twenty years of cultivation research.

This low level of explanation encourages many to dismiss cultivation theory. If we hold for a moment, however, and accept these modest findings as valid why should we be concerned if it is only responsible for a small portion of the overall distortions held in the audiences view of the world? Does it matter that television may be producing small changes in people's knowledge about what is actually operating in society? Huston, Donnerstien, Fairchild, Feshbach, Murray, Rubinstein, Wilcox, and Zuckerman (1992) suggest that even small distortions about social

realities are important to understand. Regarding televised roles of minorities they write:

> Under representation and negative portrayals may influence the self-concepts and images of their own group for members of the affected categories and may also generate attitudes and beliefs about such groups among members of the general public (p. 3)

These views, held in popular culture, may have very large *public policy effects*. Given the typically low voter turn out in elections from school boards to state and national elections, misrepresentation of issues such as crime may lead to laws and policies which do not serve to protect people but only increase the institutionalization of socially unsuccessful individuals.

New Grounds for Cultivation?

Does cultivation also occur in reference to other social issues such as the institution of the American family? While violence has most often been the topic of cultivation projects (see Greenberg et al., 1980) it has also been extended to a handful of others. In their meta-analysis Morgan and Shanahan (1995) found that while cultivation findings relating to politics were weaker on average than ones which addressed violence, the findings dealing with sex roles were nearly as strong as ones tapping issues of crime and violence.

Given the issues of gender which permeate the discourse of the family, I assert that it makes good sense to test whether or not there is a relationship between the portrait of family life on television and the relatively negative perceptions people hold regarding marital stability. Why, for example, do more people today have a more negative view of the institution of marriage when the divorce rate has fallen significantly over the past ten years (Marin, 1996)? Will we find modest yet statistically significant correlations between heavy television viewing and an exaggerated risk of divorce or marital disruption within a cultivation framework?

Before proceeding with further discussing this research question, I would like to briefly address the relevance for studying television in isolation of other media. Clearly television is not the only mass medium to enter the American home -- newspaper accounts as well as the Internet are sources of information about families -- what, then, makes television so special? Two important issues help answer this question. The first deals with the contemporary infrastructure of the American telecommunications system.

Consider first the role of the Internet. The Internet still has not permeated the lives of most

Americans. Certainly it has been growing rapidly in recent years, but the percentage of Americans who use the Internet on a daily basis is still a small fraction of the entire population. Moreover, the content on the Internet, when it comes to news, is more times than not also found packaged within other media such as television (Paterno, 1998). Given the importance of packaged messages in cultivation analysis, researchers are motivated to seek out the most popular and wide ranging media. While it is certainly true that newspapers are read by many people, television is still the single most popular communications medium in the United States. An additional measure of the ubiquity of television is the fact that millions more American households are able to watch television than are able to place telephone calls (Gross, 1996).

The second answer to the question *why just television* deals with the social or institutional role of television in America. Signorielli, (1990) working in Gerbner's Cultural Indicators Lab, sums up the role of television with her assertion that it both leads and mirrors American society. Signorielli (1990) explains that "television is the wholesale distributor of images and forms the mainstream of our popular culture" (p. 13). Because so many people watch so much television, it is understood to be an institution *in itself* which both promotes and relates to a shared, popular culture. Signorielli (1990) contends that "television is special because its socially constructed version of reality bombards all classes, groups, and ages with the same perspective at the same time" (p. 14). Morgan and Shanahan (1995) also suggest that television is, in itself, an institutional structure which constitutes a macro-social "message system" (p. 33). Television according to these authors is integral part of one's everyday identification with living in a culture.

As noted earlier, much cultivation research has addressed the issue of violence in television programming. A few studies have, however, observed issues about family life. Using the cultivation model, Skill, Robinson, and Wallace (1986) found that television tends to cultivate the notion of what constitutes good and bad families given the types of behavior exhibited. In support of Gerbner's finding regarding violence, such research suggests that individuals tend to use fictional portrayals of marriage as a source of information and guidance even when they realize that such portrayals are unrealistic or even distorted (Skill et al., 1986). Moreover, this research explains that representations of life and society on television are significant elements which tend to contribute to an individual's perception of reality which lies outside of their own homes and social networks.

While the family has been included in previous cultivation studies, these studies have not addressed the specific issue of divorce and marital dissolution. The research conducted in this study is designed to address two key issues. The first is the degree to which television accurately reflects, lags behind, or exaggerates the presentation of divorce. Clearly, before one begins to makes claims about the impact of televised content on social behavior, one must asses what families actually look like on the screen. Questions asked on the part of the researcher at this level of the study dealt with the following: How many couples portrayed on television are married? How many are intact first-marriage families? How many are divorced but not remarried?

This first step of the research was supported through a survey of the demographic characteristics of family types as seen in popular, widely distributed television programming. I selected situation comedies for the simple fact this genre almost always makes use of a family setting. Moreover, such family comedies are among the most widely viewed programs on television (Gross, 1996). Specifically in reference to issues of cultivation, these types of programs are generally long-running -- people are repeatedly exposed to their presentations. The following research question was generated out of consideration of these issues:

RQ1 What do families on television look like? This question seeks to gather information about whether families are either intact or not. What proportion of the families seen in popular programs are headed, for example, by divorced single parents?

The next issue regarding the content analysis was to compare the findings in a survey of families in situation comedies to families actually found in the world. This generated and was driven by the second research question.

RQ2 Do the observed television families over-represent, under-represent, or roughly correspond to socio-demographic data on measures of divorce and marriage?

This is a very significant starting point for the cultivation analysis because the researcher must be able to compare the views held by the participants in the study to objective measures which represent what is actually to be found in the society at large.

After addressing these two initial questions, the major area of investigation was set to be studied. The final research question addresses the cultivation effect:

RQ3 Will a survey of heavy viewers of television produce an estimate of social reality which is closer to what is seen on the screen than is seen in the US Statistical Abstract? Will light viewers differ significantly from heavy viewers?

The preceding three research questions were used to generate two hypotheses.The first of which deals with the first part of the research, the content analysis:

H1 Content analysis of prime time television programming will yield a variety of family household types, but a pattern will emerge. This pattern will portray television families experiencing divorce, remarriage, and single parent family arrangements more often than is found in demographic indexes of the social world.

The second hypothesis deals explicitly with the cultivation effect.

H2 Heavy viewers of television will exaggerate key demographic categories of marriage and divorce patterns found in contemporary American Society

Taken together, the research questions and the associated testing of these hypotheses will provide for a basis for assessing whether or not a cultivation effect influences estimates about divorce rates among married couples.[1]

Methods

An important step in this research project was the design of a questionnaire for administration to participants. The questionnaire included asking the respondents to provide estimates of a variety of marriage demographics.[2] The questionnaires were distributed to students at a Carnegie Foundation Research II University. The respondents were undergraduate students enrolled in an introduction to communication course. This sample of television viewers was selected for two reasons. The first is the fact that Morgan and Shanahan (1995) have found that young adults (those who are college-aged) have the most robust cultivation effects across the twenty years of such analysis. If there is going to be a cultivation effect on the issues of marriage and divorce, it stands to reason that this group will be more likely than others to demonstrate such a finding.

The second reason why college students make a good sample of viewers stems from this researcher's familiarity with the leisure activities of undergraduate students enrolled in college

[1] I would like to address one issue regarding data collection about family and household types. Although some communication researchers use an all-inclusive definition of family to describe many different family and household types, the research underway here will focus only on readily accessible socio-demographic data. In contrast to scholars like James Lull (1988) who includes extended and gay families in their conceptual frameworks of families, the lack of reliable statistics tracking gay female and gay male families with children precludes such family types from being coded in this research. Thus, the research conducted here focuses exclusively on heterosexual families.

2 The questions in the survey, as well as the general organization of the instrument were generated in conjunction with the generous help of Professor Robert Sanders of the Department of Communication, The University at Albany. An example of the administered questionnaire may be found in the appendix of this paper.

today. Having taught more than 500 undergraduate students in communication and media studies programs over the past 5 years and after having access to media consumption journals collected as part of such classes, it has became quite clear that many students enrolled in communication classes watch a good deal of television. Additionally, the wide variability of viewing across these informants suggests that college students make an attractive group for survey research addressing cultivation effects -- some student watch only an hour a day, others watch many more.

Section 3 Results

In reviewing the most popular and widely available situation comedies in the Fall on 1996, I found the following pattern:[3]

COMPOSITION OF FAMILY TYPES[4]

As seen on television...		As seen in CPS data...	
Intact (includes remarried)	53.9%	Intact (includes remarried)	53.9
Divorced, Single	30.7%	Divorced, Single	11.0
Widowed, Single	15.4%	Widowed,	10.9
Never Married	0.0%	Never Married	20.2[5]

Thus, the data collected in this section of the research support the first hypothesis. There did exist an identifiable pattern of families on television. Moreover, the presentation of families on television over-estimated rates of divorce, particularly in reference to rates of divorced non-remarried families. Additionally, widowed parenthood was also exaggerated on television. The most striking difference between life on the screen and family life in the United States is television's marked *underestimation* of never-married families. Nearly 20 percent of families in the United States are unmarried -- a mother and a father raising a child who are not married to each other. The content on the television screen supports the idea that distortions of reality regarding divorce and marriage is

3 Raw coding data representing the profiles of families surveyed are found in the appendix.

4 *Intact Families* : those that incorporate one or more of the following: married couples living in the same household with their children; married couples living in the same household alone; and married couples sharing a household with one or more members of their extended family. *Non intact families* : those that lack one or both of the parents and include: divorced, separated, widowed, or never married and are responsible for the care of children. *Remarried* : those families that include a spouse from one of the above non intact families who are remarried and are responsible for caring for children.[Skill et al, (1990)]

5 4% other. See www.census.gov for details.

being distributed to the general population.

175 surveys were marked and collected from the respondents. 168 of which were included in the analysis of data. 7 surveys were removed due to being incomplete or filled with the same nonsense answer throughout the questionnaire (for example, the number 5 repeated in each blank). A standard linear regression (ANOVA) was performed with these data. R^2 correlations and f-tests were performed using the software package S-Plus. None of the correlations or f-tests yielded statistically significant results at either the .01 or .05 levels.[6]

Discussion.

Clearly, content analysis research is useful in identifying and organizing the types of family representations found in television programs. This study reveals, however, that even the group of people who have historically produced the highest proportion of *television answers* in cultivation studies, do not always use such content to make estimates of social realities. Measurable cultivation did not occur in this sample of students. In sum, programming did not seem to lead or be related to estimates of the kinds of families these students felt were found in reality.

The question to answer now is, *what does this lack of findings suggest communication research should do in regard to investigating the role of television in communicators' information environments?* I suggest, in contrast to scholars such as Potter (1993) who wish to see cultivation abandoned altogether, that we broaden the study of television to include what people actually do when they sit in front of a television screen. While the wholesale distribution of images regarding crime, gender roles, and family structures yields clear pictures on the part of the researcher, they are not simply absorbed by everyday viewers. Studying the process of watching television may be very useful in accounting for how viewers construct information environments within interpersonal relations.

Another important question to answer is: *why is it that the unified content on the screen does not yield a unified view in an audience?* Previous studies of the cultivation effect attempt to answer this question by adding a variety of demographic and statistical controls to their data. As a result, they are successful in showing that heavy viewers of television who have a distorted view

6 Tables containing these supporting details of data analysis are found in the appendix of this paper.

of wealth are also highly education. The claim of these researchers is that the effect is not driven by the content on the screen but by the attainment of a higher than average rate of formal education. Again, a problem arises here: using the variable of education reveals little of what people *do with* messages. In short, a demographic explanation is performed instead of having access to viewer's larger social and communicative life. It may very well be the case that the more formally educated viewer is engaged in other communication activities while viewing, or has access to more people with whom to have conversations about televised content.

At present mass communication research exemplified in a model like cultivation analysis does not account for the local, interpersonal communicative behavior which may be used to relate images and meanings both on and off the television screen to each other. Sanders (1989), is useful in explaining part of this relationship. According to Sanders, the strength of the message on the screen comes not from the screen itself, but rather from the *social and communication pressures* placed on the communicators inside of their social relations. The communication dynamic *between* the television, its content, and the viewer's social interactions constitute the foundational elements of the communication/information environment loosely articulated in cultivation studies. In the example cited by Sanders, Nixon's *Checkers* speech, the primary elements of the information environment were found in a family's need to be reassured that their father was a strong, patriotic American. In sum, this example suggests that other communication behavior (non tele-mediated messages) should not be left out of future studies designed to explain the effects of mass-mediated messages on behavior.[7]

Again, I want to be clear to suggest that there is some evidence that mass-distributed messages do play a role in shaping macro-social ideas and behaviors. The stable, yet modest relationship between content and perception may still be useful in explaining *part* of the dynamic which ends in distorted views reported by an audience. Messages contained in mass distributed programming *do have a structure*. Moreover, this structure constricts the messages to a certain degree once sent to the audience. Certainly these messages are not completely polysemic -- they are structured in the moment of transmission and viewing. This is essential, in small part, to production of widespread coherent meanings across many different people.

7 See Sigman (1988). Here one finds that a strong case is made for qualitative media research projects which take these and other factors into account in the analysis of what we call mass media *effects*.

So, why didn't the sample in this study yield even a smallest evidence of cultivation effects? While I have no access to the localized viewing environment of the young adults in my sample, I think that it is reasonable to suggest that part of what the college students in my sample did was to watch television in a multi-channeled communication environment. For starters, College students generally do not have their own television sets which they watch in isolation of others.

Additionally, and in reference once again to the interpersonal communication-structured interaction noted in Sanders (1989), students are generally not subjected to appear to others in their social spaces to be against divorce, out-of-wedlock childbirth, single parenthood, etc. While college aged adults certainly have their ideas about such issues, television is not viewed in a local situation which places *social/communicative* pressure on them to identify what they think about, say, a situation comedy about a working class divorced women with two children. Part of the communication-managed information environment of a college student is the freedom to vacillate between ideas.

A more full explanation of the cultivation effect must also take into account how people talk *about* television both during the viewing of an episode, as well as subsequent interpersonal episodes. I believe that when research begins to account for these interpersonal dynamics, we will have a more clear understanding about why the most standardized and widely distributed messages tend to account for only 10 percent of the difference between high and low consumers of such images. In support of the rationale for observing how mass communication generated information environments are built though interpersonal communication, I suggest one consider the knowledge which is currently emerging about what we commonly call cyberspace.

This interaction, carried in a wholly communicative environment, establishes the meanings of the messages posted on a USENET newsgroups. It is the interpersonal communication which supports the meanings held in and across masses of consumers of media. Rather than become distracted that this behavior is simply related to the emergence of this newer channel of mass communication, we should consider how *all human signs systems are embodied in and give rise to human social interaction.* Much of the meaning work that communicators do when engaged in mass communication is done here -- in the local settings of conversations about the content on the screen.

I suggest that the actual structuring mechanism of the cultivation effect will be found when we

investigate how media events are given meanings through *interpersonal exchanges*. Lull (1988; 1990; 1995) has shown that people typically negotiate the boundaries of media messages in both interpersonal exchanges occurring in the presence of television as well as subsequent conversations. We need to conduct more in-depth research which observes people actually watching television and which continues to track people across their future social communicative interactions. Once this is done, we should understand more clearly how the textually structured, powerful messages found in content analysis are fed through, and at times changed in, the previously standing as well as currently unfolding interpersonal behaviors of communicators.

As shown in this study, the focus of a researcher solely on tele-mediated messages does not richly account for the behaviors communicators actually performed when viewers sit in front of televised messages. The lack of findings in this study suggests that fully accounting for messages on the screen does not explain how *effects* are produced. This relates even to the historical findings of cultivation studies. This raises a vexing question: How are *messages* used within the social framework evoked in interpersonal communicative relations?

This is where more mass communication inspired work needs to be done. Contemporary literary scholarship, for example, has demonstrated that the *meanings* of words in a mass-distributed work of fiction are not simply fixed to their lexical referents but are given meanings in the process of being fit by communicators into the social relations held *between people and such messages* (Radway, 1991). While the cultivation research suggests that messages as aired are not totally trivial, media messages themselves are actually structured in the other 90 percent of our daily communicative lives -- our ongoing interpersonal exchanges, our lived membership in a communication or interpretive community.

Conclusion

Future mass communication research should continue to value the previous findings of cultivation projects. However, the relative weakness of historical cultivation findings coupled with instances such as the one presented in this paper where no significant relationship is found between exposure to messages and estimates of social realities suggests that new research accounting for both mass-mediated and interpersonal communicative practices be performed. Certainly more

research has been moving in this direction, but the general field of communication as well as the specific areas of mass and interpersonal communication will be well served when these typically divided areas are integrated together. Then, perhaps, our field will have a better grasp on the way human communication is the primary way to understand all social events -- tele-mediated or not.

APPENDIX #1 SAMPLE OF SURVEY

This survey is designed to sample your opinions related to the state of the American Family and television programming that depicts families and households. It is designed to be completely anonymous and confidential. You are free to complete only the questions that you feel comfortable or qualified to answer. No specific information about your background or marital status is to be recorded. All responses are anonymous, confidential, and voluntary. Thank you for your time.

Age: ____ Gender: Female__ Male __ Married: Yes __ No __

Highest level of education completed: Ever Divorced: Yes __ No __

1 Public School 2 High School 3 College 4 Graduate School 5 Professional Degree

---

• The institution of the family is **threatened** by out-of-wedlock pregnancies

1 Strongly agree 2 3 4 5 Strongly disagree

• The institution of the family is **strengthened** by federal and state tax cuts

1 Strongly agree 2 3 4 5 Strongly disagree

• The institution of the family is **threatened** by gay female and gay male unions

1 Strongly agree 2 3 4 5 Strongly disagree

• The institution of the family is **strengthened** by the Family Leave Act

1 Strongly agree 2 3 4 5 Strongly disagree

• The institution of the family is **threatened** by women working outside the home

1 Strongly agree 2 3 4 5 Strongly disagree

• The institution of the family is **strengthened** through the use of subsidized child care

1 Strongly agree 2 3 4 5 Strongly disagree

• The institution of the family is **threatened** by domestic violence

1 Strongly agree 2 3 4 5 Strongly disagree

• The institution of the family is **strengthened** when needed housing assistance is provided

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly agree Strongly disagree

• The institution of the family is **threatened** by high rates of divorce

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly agree Strongly disagree

• The institution of the family is **strengthened** when they are supported by the extended family

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly agree Strongly disagree

• The institution of the family is **threatened** by images which portray families in a bad light

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly agree Strongly disagree

• The institution of the family is **strengthened** when families have access to Health Care.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly agree Strongly disagree

Provide an estimate about how frequently you believe each of the following social realities occur. Fill in the blank with a number which , in your opinion, represents an accurate estimate.

• On average ___ % of first marriages end in divorce.

• First marriages that end in divorce typically last ___ years.

• On average ___ % of remarriages end in divorce.

• Remarriages that end in divorce typically last ____ years.

• On average ___% of all White marriages will end in divorce.

• On average ___% of all Black marriages will end in divorce.

• On average ___% of all Hispanic marriages will end in divorce.

• ___ % of all children are born to unmarried mothers.

• Of all the children born to unmarried mothers:

___ % are born to White mothers
___ % are born to Black mothers
___ % are born to Hispanic mothers

• I estimate that ___ % of the population of the country is comprised of gay women and gay men.

• In __ % of marriages, women work outside of the home.

• In __ % of marriages, men are responsible for the primary care of the children living in the household.

Please read each of the following statements before you answer any of them. Make your estimates add up to 100%.

• ___% of all children are raised in two-parent households

• ___% of all children are raised in single parent households

• ___% of all children are raised in families headed by parent who have **never** been divorced

• ___% of all children are raised in families in which at least one of the parents have previously been divorced.

Please answers the following questions about your consumption of television

• I typically watch ___ hours of television programming per day.

• Of this time (*Please make your answers add up to 100%*):

___% is spent watching sitcoms
___% is spent watching the news
___% is spent watching MTV
___% is spent watching others types of programs

• If you estimated the consumption of "other" programs in the above question, please list in detail these types of programs.

---------- ----------

---------- ----------

---------- ----------

• Check off those of the following programs that you have watched in the last week

__ Cosby
__ Cybill
__ Coach
__ The Nanny
__ Mad about you
__ Foxworthy
__ Martin
__ Grace under fire
__ Family Matters
__ Roseanne
__ Pearl
__ Dave's world
__ Frasier
__ Married with Children
__ Everybody Love Raymond
__ Dr Quinn, Medicine Woman
__ Promised Land

• List, by name, the programs that you watch most frequently

---------- ----------
---------- ----------
---------- ----------
---------- ----------
---------- ----------
---------- ----------

APPENDIX #2 Typology of Marriage and Family Life on Prime Time Television[1]

Marriage		(Custodial Parent)		Household	
IN	Intact	A	Children of Intact Marriage	J	Parents (Joint)
DS	Divorced/Single	B	Father	K	Mother Headed
DR	Divorced/Remarried	C	Mother	L	Father Headed
WS	Widowed/Single	D	Pregnant Mother	M	Divorced (F/M)
WR	Widowed/Remarried	E	Grandparent/Extended	N	Widowed (F/M)
NS	Never-married Single	F	Never-married Male/Female	O	Cohabitating
NC	Never-married Cohab.	G	Adopted, _		
		H	Grown not in Household		
		I	No Children		

Types of Chores		Chores		Race	
CC	Yard work/H. Repair	P	Mother	T	White
DD	Grocery Shopping	Q	Father	U	Black
EE	Paperwork	R	Children	V	Latino
FF	Housecleaning	S	Group	W	Asian
GG	Child Care			X	Mixed
HH	Dish washing				
II	Laundry	Age of Characters (main)		Children(age)	#
JJ	Cooking	20's		Y Infant	1
KK	Dish washing	30's		Z Toddler	2
LL	Laundry	40's		AA Adolescent	3
		50's		BB Adult	4 or >
		60's			

PROGRAM	M	C	A	CA	CP	H	R	#
COSBY	IN	H	50'S	BB	H	L	U	1
FOXWORTHY	IN	A	30'S	Z	A	L	T	2
QUINN	WR	C	30'S	AA	C	K	T	2?
RAYMOND								
MARRIED	IN	A	40'S	BB	A	L	T	2
MAD	IN	D	30'S	--	D	J	T	--
PROMISED								
ROSEANNE	IN	A	40'S	BB	A	J	T	3
FRASIER	DS	I	40'S	--	--	M^b	T	--
CYBILL	DS	C	40'S?	BB	C	M^a	T	2
NANNY	WS	B	40'S	AA	B	N^b	T	3
GRACE	DS	C	30'S	AA	C	M^a	T	1
PEARL	DS	C	50's	BB	C	M^a	T	1
COACH	DR	H	50'S	BB	H	L	T	1
FAMILY	IN	A	40'S	BB	A	L	U	3

[1] This Represents programming available through December 31, 1996. Sample was gathered from the lineup offered from 8:00pm until 10:00pm (Monday through Friday). The offerings of ABC, CBS, NBC, and FOX are included here. I selected programs that had a family as the main vehicle for the storyline.

COMPOSITION OF FAMILY TYPES :	
Intact	46.2%
Divorced, Single	30.7%
Divorced, Remarried	7.7%
Widowed, Single	7.7%
Widowed, Remarried	7.7%
Never Married	0.0%

CUSTODIAL PARENT:	
Children of Intact Marriage	30.7%
Mother	30.7%
Father	7.7%
Pregnant Mother	7.7%
Grown Children not in household	15.5%
No Children	7.7%
Grandparent/Extended family	0.0%
Never-married Male/Female	0.0%
Cohabitating	0.0%
Adopted	0.0%

AGE OF CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD:	
Adult/Young Adult	64.0%
Adolescent	27.0%
Toddler	9.0%

RACE	
White	84.6%
Black	15.4%

---

* Clearly this is very basic. I am interested in continuing this type of analysis, but I am also very interested in the material below. The coding of the material below requires a great deal of detail. I also need to think about a methodology to include these results into for the purposes of my research.

Types of Chores		Chores	
CC	Yard work/H. Repair	P	Mother
DD	Grocery Shopping	Q	Father
EE	Paperwork	R	Children
FF	Housecleaning	S	Group
GG	Child Care		
HH	Dish washing		
II	Laundry		
J J	Cooking		
KK	Dish washing		
LL	Laundry		

From: *Statistical Abstract of the United States* (1995).----------

#143	Marriages and Divorces 1970 to 1990 Divorce and Annulment Rate (per 1,000 married women 15 and older)	1970 1980 1990	14.9 22.6 20.9
#146	Divorces and Annulments--Children Involved	1970 1980 1990	12.5 17.3 16.8

APPENDIX #3 Statistical Data

ANOVA for Variable 2 (Divorce)

	Df	Sum of Sq	Mean Sq	F Value	Pr(F)
tvcat	2	228.98	114.4925	0.5498924	0.5781334

Coefficients:

	Value	Std. Error	t value	Pr (>|t|)
(Intercept)	49.1841856	1.316945	37.3471836	0.00
tvcat med	1.2578125	1.239461	1.0148060	0.31
tvcat high	0.3169981	1.105557	0.2867316	0.77

Residual standard error: 14.43 on 155 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-Squared: 0.007045

ANOVA for Variable 3 (Marriage Length)

	Df	Sum of Sq	Mean Sq	F Value	Pr(F)
tvcat	2	42.231	21.11540	2.191754	0.1152163

Coefficients:

	Value	Std. Error	t value	Pr (>|t|)
(Intercept)	4.27984574	0.2841207	15.06347649	0.00
tvcat1 med	-0.56237425	0.2686128	-2.09362424	0.04
tvcat2 high	-0.01492287	0.2380623	-0.06268474	0.95

Residual standard error: 3.104 on 153 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-Squared: 0.02785

ANOVA for variable 4 (Divorce of remarriages)

	Df	Sum of Sq	Mean Sq	F Value	Pr(F)
tvcat	2	387.16	193.5818	0.5607701	0.5719534

Coefficients:

	Value	Std. Error	t value	Pr (>|t|)
(Intercept)	34.8737060	1.705342	20.449690	0.00
tvcat1 med	0.5010352	1.618833	0.309504	0.76
tvcat2 high	-1.4368530	1.426412	-1.007320	0.32

Residual standard error: 18.58 on 151 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-Squared: 0.007373

ANOVA for variable 18 (Never divorced families)

	Df	Sum of Sq	Mean Sq	F Value	Pr(F)
tvcat	2	1369.18	684.5901	2.107254	0.1252289

Coefficients:

	Value	Std. Error	t value	Pr (>|t|)
(Intercept)	29.1033391	1.685674	17.2651038	0.00
tvcat1 med	0.1944311	1.589287	0.1223385	0.90
tvcat2 high	2.9007114	1.414056	2.0513419	0.05

Residual standard error: 18.02 on 147 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-Squared: 0.02787

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

References

Bryant, J. (1990). *Television and the American Family*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Commerce, United States Department of (1996). *Statistical Abstract of the United States*. Washington, CA: DOC.

Douglas, W. and Olson, B.M. (1995). Beyond Family Structure: The Family in Domestic Comedy. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 39 (2). 236-261.

Gerbner, G. and Gross, L. (1976). Living with television. *Journal of Communication*, 26, (3). 173-199.

Goldscheider, F. Waite, L. (1991). New families? No Families?

Greenberg, B.S.; Hines, M.; Buerkel-Rothfuss, N. and Atkin, C.K. (1980). Family Role Structures and interactions in Commercial Television. In Greenberg, B. (ed.), *Life on Television* (149-160). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Group.

Greenberg, B.S.; Simmons, K. W.; Hogan, L. and Atkin, C.K. (1980). The Demography of Fictional TV Characters. In Greenberg, B. (ed.), *Life on Television* (35-47). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Group.

Gross, L.S. (1996). *Telecommunications: An introduction to electronic media*. Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown Communications, Inc.

Lull, J. (1995). *Media, Communication, Culture*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Lull, J. (1988). *World families watch television*. Newbury Park, CA:Sage.

Marin, R. (1996). Nuking the nuclear family. Newsweek, April 29, 1993. p. 70.

Morgan. M, and Shanahan, J. (1995) Cultivation Analysis: A meta-analysis. Communication Yearbook (vol 20).

Paterno, D. (1998). Internet/Radio/Television/Print news survey. Unpublished research.

Perse, E. M. (1990). Cultivation and involvement with local television news. In Signorielli, et al. (eds.), *Cultivation analysis: New directions in media effects research* (pp. 51-69). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Potter, W.J. (1993). Cultivation Analysis revisited. *Human Communication Research 19 (4)*, 564-601.

Radway, J. (1991). *Reading the romance: Women, patriarchy, and popular literature*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Sanders, R. E. (1989). *Message effects via induced changes in the social meaning of a response*. In J.J. Bradac (ed.). Message effects in Communication Science. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Sigman, S. J. (1988). *The ethnography of communication and qualitative media research.* Paper presented to the Eastern Communication Association. April/May.

Signorielli, N. (1990). Cultivation analysis: Conceptualization and methodology. In Signorielli, et al. (eds.), *Cultivation analysis: New directions in media effects research* (pp. 51-69). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Skill, T; Robinson, J.D. and Wallace, S.P. (1986). Portrayal of Family on Prime-Time TV: Structure, Type and Frequency. *Journalism Quarterly, 63* (3). 360-367: 398.

Taylor, E. (1989). *Prime-time Families: Television Culture in Postwar America.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.